UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,826	12/06/2005	Yasuhiko Otsubo	960/197	3639	
23838 K FNVON & K	7590 05/01/2007	,	EXAMINER		
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W.			NGUYEN, TU MINH		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	2 2000 5		PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3748		
`			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/01/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

0	۲
と	L

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/559,826	OTSUBO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Tu M. Nguyen	3748

	Tu M. Nguyen	3748	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS	hut wing to the date of films a brief	will not be entered b	0001100
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		the about a secondary	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) hew the new or amended claims would be rejected is pre 		II be entered and and	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	rided below of appointed.		
Claim(s) allowed:		. :	
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5-8,10 and 11</u> .	•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	·		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.	-	Tu M. No	guyen
		Tu M. N. 4/26/2	1 U 007
		((,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Kawashima et al. indeed execute a PM elimination control for supplying unburned fuel component to the catalyst (41) to increase a temperature of the catalyst. As shown in Figure 14 and indicated on lines 52-62 of column 13, when the engine operating condition is in region R3, a post fuel injection is performed during an expansion stroke to provide partially oxidized components such as hydrogen, CO, and short chained HC to the catalyst so that the components are oxidized at the catalyst to raise its temperature.

As outlined in the Response to Arguments section of the Final Rejection mailed on December 29, 2006, Schaller et al. clearly teach or suggest a step of intermittently injecting a fuel addition for a predetermined number of times at a final stage of the PM elimination control.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the intermittent fuel addition increases a catalyst temperature in order to burn up particulate matter that is deposited at an upstream end of a particulate filter) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).